

JASPER WEEKLY COURIER.

VOL. 15.

JASPER, INDIANA, FRIDAY, JULY 4, 1873.

NO. 20.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY, AT JASPER
DUBOIS COUNTY, INDIANA, BY
CLEMENT DOANE.

OFFICE.—IN COURIER BUILDING ON
WEST MAIN STREET.

PRICE OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Single Subscription, for fifty Nos., \$1 50
For six months, : : : : : 100

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

For square of 10 lines or less, we'll, \$1 00
Each subsequent insertion, 75 cts.

Longer advertisements at the same rate.
A fraction over even square or squares,
counted as a square. These are the terms
for transient advertisements; a reasonable
reduction will be made to regular adver-
tisers.

Notices of appointment of adminis-
trators and legal notices of like character to
be paid in advance.

ANNOUNCING CANDIDATES.

For Township officers, each \$1 00
For County " " 2 50

For District, Circuit, or State, 5 00

— WILL A. TRAYLOR,

Attorney at Law;

JASPER, INDIANA.

With practice in the Courts of Indiana and adjacent
States. Prompt attention given to the collection of claims.

July 12, 1873.

ROY JOHN BAKER, CLE ESTEPSON
JASPER.

WILLIAM S. GUTTNER,
ATTORNEY AT LAW.

And Notary Public,

JASPER, INDIANA.

With practice in all the Courts of Indiana and adjacent
States. Prompt attention given to the collection of claims.

July 12, 1873.

HENRY A. PEED, W. R. GARDNER,
PEED & GARDNER.

Attorneys at Law,

Lafayette, : : : Indiana.

With practice in the Courts of Indiana and adjacent
States. Prompt attention given to the collection of claims.

July 12, 1873.

JOHN C. SCHAFER,
Attorney at Law,

JASPER, INDIANA.

With practice in the Courts of Indiana and adjacent
States. Social attention given to the collection of claims.

July 12, 1873.

COX & HOLTHAUS,
Attorneys at Law,

WILLIAM COX & HENRY HOLTHAUS,
Attorneys at Law.

With practice in the Courts of Indiana and adjacent
States. Social attention given to the collection of claims.

July 12, 1873.

GEORGE STEGE, BEILING,
STEGE & REILING.

WHOLESALE DEALERS IN

GROCERIES, PROVISIONS, TEAS,
TOBACCO, CIGARS.

WABASH STREET.

North side between Second & Third Sts.

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

P. S.—Prompt attention to orders from the country.

Sept. 12, 1873.

PALMER HOUSE.

JEFF. K. SCOTT, Proprietor.

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA.

LOCATED in the central portion of the city and
with the best accommodations for guests.

January 21, 1873.

FULDA EXCHANGE.

FULDA, SPENCER COUNTY, IND.

BARNEY SCHNEIDER, Proprietor.

GOOD ACCOMMODATION FOR TRADE AND BOARD. The
table is always set, and the house is well supplied with
the necessaries of life. A share of public papers is
offered to all.

July 24, 1873.

ROCKPORT & JASPER MAIL ROUTE.

The undersigned having received the

contract for carrying the mail to

Rockport, respectfully informs any one

desiring to go to Rockport, that he will

provide means for carrying them on

Mondays and Fridays if they will leave

word on the day before at the Post office

in Jasper. JOSEPH UHRICH.

July 8th, 1873.

Circuit Court.

The following is the disposition made
of the civil causes docketed for the
June term of the Dubois Circuit Court:

Williams vs. Maples; partition; final
report.

Schmidt vs. Schmidt; partition; final
report.

Miller vs. Lori; partition ordered, and
applied to Supreme Court granted.

J. R. Simmons vs. D. Simmons; di-
vorce; granted.

Brown vs. Evans; partition; continued.

Tausig vs. Kiester; on note; continued.

Wunder vs. Goodman; judgment for

\$500.

Brenner vs. Brenner; partition; cont'd.

Wolf & Schimpff vs. J. M. Mehling;
judgment for foreclosure for \$492 25.

Herbig vs. Petri; partition; continued.

Aders vs. Tempel; dismissed.

Cave vs. Cave; Guardian; judgment

for \$250 00.

Moog, Adair, vs. Nischau et al.; adm'r;
judgment for \$275 00.

L. Green vs. W. Monroe, adm'r.; con-
tinued.

J. Flick, et al., Trustee, vs. Schurz, est.
judgment for \$60 00.

H. W. Barker vs. D. Riley; judgment for

\$12 00.

Young vs. Young; divorce; dismissed.

Lieske vs. Schmidt; appeal; judgment for

defendant.

Hill vs. Schmidt; judgment for \$55 00.

Dilger vs. Beckman; judgment for
defendant and \$272 damages; judgment set aside and new trial ordered.

Gans vs. Dilks; foreclosure for \$1 500.

Brandt vs. Black and Divide; judg-
ment for \$65 00.

Gopper et al. vs. N. Schmidt; judg-
ment for 197 50.

Bretz vs. Borman; judgment \$145 51.

Brock vs. Vinen; judgment \$30 57.

Geo. L. Swanger vs. B. H. Scott; judg-
ment for \$120 00.

Gusman vs. Danhofer; judgment for

\$100 00.

Conliffe, adm'r vs. McElroy; judg-
ment for \$5 20.

Conliffe, adm'r vs. J. W. Nicholson
et al.; judgment for \$33 75.

Wm. L. Green vs. Morgan; appeal
judgment for debt.

K. B. Burton vs. J. Davison, et al.;
judgment for \$135 27.

Hirsch vs. Hackney; continued.

Snathers vs. Woodward; continued.

Harris vs. Harris; divorce; dismissed.

Herbig vs. P. Campbell and J. G. Har-
rison; judgment for \$15 50.

L. Bretz vs. Jos. Miller; judgment for

\$100 40.

Kahn vs. Berger; dismissed.

Harold vs. Jos. A. Miller; judgment for

\$12 00.

W. S. Calfee & Sons vs. J. Haagen
et al.; Ecker; judgment for \$100 23.

Tierman, adm'r vs. F. Schwapp; judg-
ment for \$100 15.

Calfee & Sons vs. J. Lester; dis-
missed.

W. Heitbrink vs. Geo. Fogel; judg-
ment for \$100 28.

Sidle vs. C. H. Breinig; forfeited re-
cogn.; judgment for \$20 00.

E. Pitman vs. T. A. Whitten; partition
ordered, and commissioners appointed.

J. H. Wilbers vs. E. Fingston et al.;
judgment for \$144 65.

Hopke & Haxthausen vs. J. Berger;
judgment for \$41 65.

F. Pretefer vs. D. Miller; judgment for

\$144 80.

M. Fogel vs. Geo. Danhoefer et al.;
judgment for \$139 07.

Conley vs. Gray; partition ordered &
continued.

Schell, Guardian vs. Miller and Gos-
man; judgment for \$244 92.

Bicker vs. Engert; appeal; continued.

A. Harbison vs. Geo. Danhoefer and
wife; foreclosure for \$557 80.

Monroe, adm'r vs. L. Grech; judgment

for \$44 41.

H. Schell vs. Schulte; foreclosure; judg-
ment for \$478 93.

DeMott, et al. vs. Holder, et al.; con-
tinued.

Shurz vs. Gohman, adm'r; finding for
both parties.

Board of Co. Commissioners vs. Kueber,
Guardian of Debts; continued.

J. Billard vs. Jones, adm'r; judgment for

\$21 00.

Jos. Sermersheim vs. F. Fink, adm'r;
judgment for \$43 19.

L. Green vs. Monroe, adm'r; judgment for

\$11 50.

Jos. Strige vs. D. Riley, adm'r; judg-
ment for \$20 00.

R. M. Wetman vs. Fink, adm'r; judg-
ment for \$99 00.

Jos. Sermersheim vs. Schitter, adm'r;
judgment for \$16 00.

Lamper vs. Fink, adm'r; judgment for

\$139 29.

P. Horton vs. R. Horton's est.; judg-
ment for \$29 00.

J. Horton vs. R. Horton's est.; judg-
ment for \$41 00.

C. Horton vs. R. Horton's est.; judg-
ment for \$53 10.

HENDRICKS-MORTON.

The Signs of the Future—What
the Outlook Foretells.

Frank Leslie's Magazine considering
the politics of the day has this to say of
the two Indians:

At times certain men seem to stand
out both as Presidential aspirants and
as leaders of parties. Just now Indiana,
singularly enough, presents two of
her statesmen, each of whom is the lead-
er of his party in national as well as in
State affairs—Governor Hendricks and
Senator Morton. Both are strong men,
both are ambitious for Presidential hon-
ors, and both may develop very great
strength among the people between this
and the time when the next national
conventions are to be held. As Governor
or Senator, owing to the position
which his party has accorded him, must
in a great measure become the founder
of what is to be the Democratic party
of the future, it would be premature to
discuss his chances for a Presidential
nomination. These depend upon the
form and shape he gives to the Democ-
racy. It was the case last year, he
allowed other and weaker men to frame
the policy of his party, it will be impos-
sible for him either to receive or accept
any consideration from his newer lead-
ers. He must reorganize and control it
whether he would be its candidate or
have it once